

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., and )  
CISCO TECHNOLOGY, INC., )  
 )  
Plaintiffs, )  
v. ) C.A. No. 07-113-GMS  
 )  
TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., )  
 )  
Defendant. )

## **FINAL JOINT CLAIM CHART**

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSH & TUNNELL LLP  
Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)  
1201 North Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899-1347  
(302) 658-9200  
[jblumenfeld@mnat.com](mailto:jblumenfeld@mnat.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Cisco Systems Inc. and Cisco Technology Inc.*

## OF COUNSEL:

Matthew D. Powers  
Edward R. Reines  
Sonal N. Mehta  
**WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP**  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
(650) 802-3000

David Greenbaum  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
(212) 310-8000

ASHBY & GEDDES  
Steven J. Balick (#2114)  
John G. Day (#2403)  
Tiffany Geyer Lydon (#3950)  
500 Delaware Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 1150  
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-1150  
(302) 654-1888  
[sbalick@ashby-geddes.com](mailto:sbalick@ashby-geddes.com)  
[jday@ashby-geddes.com](mailto:jday@ashby-geddes.com)  
[tlydon@ashby-geddes.com](mailto:tlydon@ashby-geddes.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant Telcordia Technologies, Inc.*

OF COUNSEL:

Vincent P. Kovalick  
Christopher T. Blackford  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP  
901 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 408-4000

Pursuant to Paragraph 3 of the July 31, 2007 Scheduling Order, Plaintiffs Cisco Systems Inc. and Cisco Technology Inc. (collectively “Cisco”) and Defendant Telcordia Technologies, Inc. (“Telcordia”) jointly submit this Final Joint Claim Chart.

The parties have agreed on the following constructions:

United States Patent No. 6,377,988, Claim 1

1. “predetermined function” in claim 1 means “a function that has been determined beforehand.”

United States Patent No. 5,142,622, Claim 7

1. “network domain” in claim 7 means “the address family of a socket, and not a domain-naming domain. A domain naming domain is a concept of a related group of hierarchical addresses, wherein each part of the address is separated by a delimiter such as a period.”

2. “network protocol architecture” in claim 7 means “network domain.”

United States Patent No. 6,377,988, Claim 1

Claim Term	Cisco's Proposed Construction and Supporting Intrinsic Evidence	Telcordia's Proposed Construction and Supporting Intrinsic Evidence
group-specific instruction	an instruction that is understood by a specific group	an instruction in a format that is understood and can be processed by each network element of a specific group August 24, 1999, Amendment at 3-5.
generic instruction	an instruction applicable to all relevant elements Col. 2, ll 10-11.	an instruction that can be translated into separate group-specific instructions applicable to each individual element of defined groups of elements Col. 2, ll. 12-14; August 24, 1999, Amendment at 3-5.

United States Patent No. 5,142,622, Claim 7

Claim Term	Cisco's Proposed Construction and Supporting Intrinsic Evidence	Telcordia's Proposed Construction and Supporting Intrinsic Evidence
socket	<p>an object that identifies a communication end point in a network</p> <p>Col. 2, ll. 27-28</p>	<p>an application program interface (API) that was developed for the Berkeley version of AT&amp;T's UNIX operating system for interconnecting applications running on data processing systems in a network. It is an object that identifies a communication end point in a network, can be connected to other sockets, and hides the protocol of the network architecture beneath a lower layer</p> <p>Col. 2, ll. 23-37; June 29, 1990, Amendment at 11.</p>
routing facility	<p>a facility that establishes a connection between the sockets in the first and second data processing systems</p>	<p>an intermediate facility in a socket layer that includes a routing agent software, a socket routing protocol, and a route database or cache for establishing sockets in the facility, and then establishing at the socket layer a connection between sockets in first and second data processing systems that each operate in a different network domain</p> <p>Col. 3, ll. 48-52, 62-64; Col. 4, ll. 3-5; Col. 5, ll. 2-5, 32-33; Col. 5, L. 51-Col. 6, L. 2 ; Col. 10, ll. 43-45; Figure 1; Figure 7.</p>

Claim Term	Cisco's Proposed Construction and Supporting Intrinsic Evidence	Telcordia's Proposed Construction and Supporting Intrinsic Evidence
socket connection	a communication path between a first socket and second socket	<p>a communication path between a first socket and a second socket with an intermediate routing facility between the first socket and the second socket, the routing of the communications being performed at a layer that contains the sockets</p> <p>Col. 3, ll. 48-52, 62-64; Col. 4, ll. 3-5, 16-18; Col. 5, ll. 2-5.</p>
data processing system	<p>a system for executing application programs</p> <p>January 24, 1991, Amendment at 5</p>	<p>a system, including computer systems and associated personnel, that performs input, processing, storage output, and control functions to accomplish a sequence of operations on data, excluding a terminal</p> <p>January 24, 1991, Amendment at 5.</p> <p>Extrinsic Evidence: IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms, Sixth Edition (April 1997).</p>
means for mapping protocols between said first and second network domain	<p>This claim element is a means-plus function limitation subject to 35 U.S.C. § 112(6).</p> <p>The claimed function is mapping protocols between the first and second network domain.</p> <p>The corresponding structure is software within socket layer 32 as described at 9:30-11:19.</p>	<p>This claim element is a means-plus function limitation subject to 35 U.S.C. § 112(6).</p> <p>The claimed function is mapping protocols between the first and second network domain.</p> <p>The corresponding structure is software within socket layer 32 as described at 9:30-11:19, and the hardware executing that software.</p>

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

*/s/ Jack B. Blumenfeld*

---

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)  
1201 North Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899-1347  
(302) 658-9200  
[jblumenfeld@mnat.com](mailto:jblumenfeld@mnat.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Cisco Systems Inc. and Cisco Technology Inc.*

OF COUNSEL:

Matthew D. Powers  
Edward R. Reines  
Sonal N. Mehta  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
(650) 802-3000

David Greenbaum  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
(212) 310-8000

ASHBY & GEDDES

*/s/ Steven J. Balick*

---

Steven J. Balick (#2114)  
John G. Day (#2403)  
Tiffany Geyer Lydon (#3950)  
500 Delaware Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 1150  
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-1150  
(302) 654-1888  
[sbalick@ashby-geddes.com](mailto:sbalick@ashby-geddes.com)  
[jday@ashby-geddes.com](mailto:jday@ashby-geddes.com)  
[tlydon@ashby-geddes.com](mailto:tlydon@ashby-geddes.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant Telcordia Technologies, Inc.*

OF COUNSEL:

Vincent P. Kovalick  
Christopher T. Blackford  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP  
901 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 408-4000